

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JEFFERY DONELL ROBINSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

C. CRYER, ET. AL.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:20-cv-00980-JLT-HBK (PC)

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
TO ELECTRONICALLY FILE DOCUMENTS
TO THE COURTS

(Doc. No. 35)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's "motion requesting to . . . electronically file documents to the Courts and to the California Deputy Attorney General." (Doc. No. 35). Plaintiff asks for access to the Court's case management electronic case filing system (CM/ECF). (*Id.* at 1). Plaintiff states that he has access to an Android tablet and believes electronically filing will assist him in this case. (*Id.*). Plaintiff initiated this action as a prisoner proceeding *pro se* by filing a prisoner civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. No. 1). Plaintiff is no longer incarcerated but continues in this action *pro se*. (Doc. Nos. 37, 38).

The Court utilizes CM/ECF, which requires attorneys to adhere to electronic procedures in the Court's Local Rules to file documents electronically. Local Rule 133(a) (E.D. Cal. March 1, 2020). *Pro se* parties are specifically exempted, and indeed prohibited, from utilizing electronic filing unless granted permission from the assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge. Local Rule 133(b)(2); Local Rule 183(c). Any requests from an exempted party to utilize electronic filing

1 “shall be submitted as stipulations as provided in L.R. 143.” Local Rule 133(b)(3). If a
2 stipulation cannot be obtained, the moving party shall include in his request “an explanation of
3 the reasons for the exception.” *Id.*

4 Here, the parties do not so stipulate. Further, while the Court is sensitive to the challenges
5 Plaintiff faces as a *pro se* litigant, the Court does not find Plaintiff’s reasons constitute sufficient
6 grounds to be granted an exemption from conventional filing. This result is consistent with other
7 orders issued in the Eastern District of California. *See Lucero v. Pennella*, Case No. 1:18-cv-
8 01448-LJO-SAB, 2018 WL 5793429, *2 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 2, 2018) (denying *pro se* plaintiff’s
9 motion for reconsideration order denying access to CM/ECF).

10 Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

11 Plaintiff’s motion to electronically file documents (Doc. No. 35) is DENIED.

12
13 Dated: June 9, 2022


HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE